



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Sheryl Sue Halloway
Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025

COPY MAILED

JUL 30 2008

In re Application of	:	
J. Leslie Vogel, III	:	
Application No. 09/659,864	:	DECISION ON PETITION
Filed: September 12, 2000	:	
Attorney Docket No. 0044860.P2436	:	

This is a decision on the petition under the unintentional provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b), filed April 16, 2008, to revive the above-identified application.

The petition is **GRANTED**.

This application became abandoned as a result of petitioner's failure to take appropriate action in a timely manner after the decision of October 19, 2007 by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences. Therefore, the proceedings as to the rejected claims were terminated. *See* 37 CFR 1.197(b). As no claim was allowed, the application became abandoned on December 20, 2007. A Notice of Abandonment was mailed on March 7, 2008. *See* MPEP 1214.06.

The petition satisfies the requirements of 37 CFR 1.137(b) in that petitioner has supplied (1) the reply in the form of a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) fee of \$810 and submission (an amendment), (2) the petition fee of \$1540, and (3) a proper statement of unintentional delay. Accordingly, the RCE is accepted as being unintentionally delayed.

It is not apparent whether the person signing the statement of unintentional delay was in a position to have firsthand or direct knowledge of the facts and circumstances of the delay at issue. Nevertheless, such statement is being treated as having been made as the result of a reasonable inquiry into the facts and circumstances of such delay. See 37 CFR 10.18(b) and Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure; Final Rule Notice, 62 Fed. Reg. 53131, 53178 (October 10, 1997), 1203. Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 63, 103 (October 21, 1997). In the event that such an inquiry has not been made, petitioner must make such an inquiry. If such inquiry results in the discovery that it is not correct that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional, petitioner must notify the Office.

The application file does not indicate a change of address has been filed in this case, although the address given on the petition differs from the address of record. A change of address should be filed in this case in accordance with MPEP 601.03. A courtesy copy of this decision is being mailed to the address noted on the petition. However, until otherwise instructed, all future correspondence regarding this application will be mailed solely to the address of record.

Telephone inquiries concerning this decision should be directed to Kimberly Inabinet at (571) 272-4618.

This application is being referred to Technology Center AU 2134 for appropriate action by the Examiner in the normal course of business on the reply received April 16, 2008.



Carl Friedman
Petitions Examiner
Office of Petitions

cc: Chui-Kiu Teresa Wong
Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor &
Zafman, LLP
1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040